HEHORANDUM

From: Henry A. Kissinger

SUBJECT: Summary of Conversations in Germany about Megotiations

The following represents a summary of my conversations on the subject of negotiations with various German officials and political leaders. I am presenting it chronologically.

On Thursday morning, February 15th, I saw.

At the end of our conversation, he said he was now very resssured about the problem of military integration. He was, however, very worried about political unity. In particular, he was concerned about the procedure which had been adopted with respect to negotiations with the Soviet Union.

While he could understand our desire to negotiate, the process of bilateral negotiations was very dangerous. He was very concerned that the Soviet Union would now encourage Great Britain to make a try, and afterwards demand that the Federal Republic negotiate bilaterally. In this manner, the Soviet Union could achieve the objective cutlined in their note of December 27th, and force the Federal Republic into bilateral negotiations. They could then make proposals which could only deeply embarrass the Federa Republic or else make it appear the villain if the negotiations broke down. We should keep in mind these observations for the future.

There was no time for me to explore this subject further.

On Thursday evening, February 15th, I met at dinner

SANITIZED ----

E.O. 12356, Sec. 3.4

NLK-89-67

SKF , NARA, Date 3/90

COLUMN

13 in

On Friday, February 16th, I had lunch with the made the following points: It was essential for the Federal Republic to negotiate directly with the Soviet Union. The goal of these negotiations should be to obtain an amelioration of the Ulbrich regime. Of course, the Federal Republic was an ally of the United States and would undertake no actions which we opposed. However, it should be



able to have a certain freedom of action wig-a-wis the Boviet Union.

I asked him what concessions they were willing to offer in return for an amelioration of the Ulbricht regime. replied vaguely and suggested that no outsider really had the right to ask such a question. I persisted and asked whether they might recommend the recognition of the Oder-Neisse line. This, they maintained, was absolutely unscceptable. It was a concession totally out of proportion to a Berlin settlement, not even acceptable in return for the amelioration of the East German regime. They replied in either a confused or deliberately ambiguous way that the concessions should be sought in Germany's military status.

In the efternoon of the 16th, I met with

I have reported part of this conversation elsewhere. I seked him how he
envisaged the future negotiations if there were an impasse in the GromykoThompson talks. He replied that a German memorandum was going to the Soviet
Union in reply to their note of December 27th, and that the FDP had approved
it.

I asked him what he thought of the question of federal offices in Berlin. He replied that he was personally opposed to removing any, but that in any case, this was an unimportant muanca compared with the issues still dividing the negotiators.

He then said that very often the Germans were being asked to assume responsibility for negotiations and to demonstrate greater initiative. He said, "Let us be frank. Whenever we are asked to show greater initiative, what you really mean is that we should make concessions. You don't want us to show initiative on the issue of German unification. You want us to show it on the issue of rights to concede to the Soviets. I always tell

WHATE AND

He then launched into a discussion of DeGaulle's views on negotiations, which I have reported separately.

In the evening of February 16th, I met for dinner with a group of German industrialists, roughly the constituency of the right wing of the CDU and the FDP. Most of the conversation concerned strategic matters.

I asked whether the Oder-Neisse line could be recognized in return for improving the status of Berlin. The unanimous opinion, which was quite violently expressed, was that this could not be done. Some of those present suggested that the United States was pressing for a conventional build-up so that it could accept a conventional defeat as a means of getting out of Berlin gracefully.

They also stressed that no reduction of the political ties between Berlin and the Federal Republic was acceptable to them.

On Saturday, February 17th, I had lunch with

stressed that any negotiation had to retain

a domand for German unification. He said that the younger generation in

Germany would not accept indefinitely the argument that they had to pay

for the crimes committed by their fathers. He also vehemently rejected

my suggestion that the Oder-Neisse line be accepted in return for access

guarantees. He said that this was paying rent for Berlin and would merely

lead to new demands. Finally, he opposed any effort to increase the status

of the East German regime.



130

on the plane was	
on the siene was a consequence to the second	•••••
,	

Comment: These conversations suggest the following dilemma: The parties in Germany who are essentially pro-Western alliance are opposed to negotiations, while those who favor negotiations are essentially nationalist. As long as this attitude persists, the French have a certain leverage.

Progress in our NATO planning depends also to a considerable extent on the ability to keep the present psychological state in Germany. Any deterioration in this respect might induce the Germans to pick up their French option. And such a deterioration could occur if we do not make sure to bring the Germans along and make them assume responsibility in the negotiations over Berlin.

